



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,345	12/20/2001	Steve Y. Chang	884.690US1	9612

7590

05/08/2003

Schwegman, Lundberg, Woessner & Kluth, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER

PHAN, THANH S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2841

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/027,345

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh S Phan

Art Unit

2841

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-10, 13-16, 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Collins et al. [6,018,125].

Collins et al. disclose an electronic component [figure 2] mounted within a chassis [10] including a polymer electromagnetic interference (EMI) shield [14] comprising: a waveguide body including an array of circular waveguide cells [18] each having a contiguous inner surface; and an absorber layer [column 2, lines 60-61] covering at least a portion of each contiguous inner surfaces and capable of absorbing electromagnetic radiation over a select frequency range.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. in view of Mitchell [6,426,459].

Collins et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for: each waveguide cells having a polygonal crosssection, and the shield being formed of a metallic material.

Mitchell discloses a waveguide shield [10] formed of metal having polygonal shape cells.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the shield design of Mitchell for the shield design of Collins et al. for the purpose of improving ventilation.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 17 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al.

Collins et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for: the polygonal cross-sectional shape being rectangular, the specific absorber layer thickness and the specific resistivity of the absorber layer.

The specific shape of the waveguide, absorber layer thickness and resistivity would have been obvious design consideration based on the specific application intended for the device.

Regarding claims 25-26, to use screws to attach the shielding to the chassis would have been obvious in order to securely mounted the shield thereto.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. in view of Narang et al. [5,976,666].

Collins et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for: the absorber layer including an epoxy resin filled with particles having a high magnetic loss over the select frequency range.

Narang et al. disclose an absorber layer for an EMI shield including an epoxy resin filled with particles having a high magnetic loss over the select frequency range [abstract].

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use magnetic particles in the absorber layer of Collins et al. for the purpose of controlling frequencies.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Urein et al. [6,324,075] ; Clements et al. [5,928,076] ; Hailey et al. [6,252,161] ; Cherniski et al. [6,297,446].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh S Phan whose telephone number is 703-305-0069. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David S Martin can be reached on 703-308-3121. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7721 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/027,345
Art Unit: 2841

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

tsp
May 4, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Martin', with a stylized, elongated final stroke.

DAVID MARTIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800